



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,945	02/05/2002	Max Schireson	ORCL-2000-136-01	3623
45591 7590 11/06/2008 ORACLE C/O MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP TWO NORTH MARKET STREET THIRD FLOOR SAN JOSE, CA 95113				
EXAMINER				
CHEUNG, MARY DA ZHI WANG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3694				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/06/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/071,945

Applicant(s)

SCHIRESON, MAX

Examiner

MARY CHEUNG

Art Unit

3694

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on October 1, 2008. Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1, 8 and 15 are amended. Claims 1-21 are examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed October 1, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's arguments that Alumbaugh (., US 6,442,592 B1) fails to teach "said submitting said log in information further comprises submitting said log in information over an Intranet link, and wherein said intranet link is separate from the Internet", the examiner respectfully disagrees. Alumbaugh clearly teaches the log in information is submitted over an intranet link 114 within the intranet 110, wherein the intranet link 114 and the intranet 110 is separate from the internet 104 (see column 3 lines 32-62 and Fig. 1).

The applicant argues that Immerman (6,785,721 B1) fails to teach obtain a privilege level for editing a web page as claimed in claims 6, 13 and 20. The examiner believes that Immerman teaches different level of privilege for access (column 19 line 66 - column 20 line 21), and the primary reference Moore (US 2001/0049672 A1) teaches editing a web page (Figs. 6-15 and ¶ 62, 94); therefore the combined teaching discloses the limitation. Furthermore, the examiner would like to point out that the limitations "for editing the Web page", "for modifying a greater number of items of the Web page than the first privilege level" are intended uses and not positive limitations. It

is not clear if the devices perform the actions as described. See *In re Schreiber*, 44 USPQ 2d 1429, and *In re Collier*, 158 USPQ 266. In conclusion, Moore modified with Alumbaugh teaches submitting login information as discussed in claim 1 below, and Immerman teaches different level of privilege for access; thus the combined teachings of Moore, Alumbaugh, and Immerman teaches the claimed limitation in claims 6, 13 and 20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 8 and 15 recites the limitation "the Internet". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-21 are rejected for incorporating the errors of their respective base claims by dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5, 8-12 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al., US 2001/0049672 A1 in view of Alumbaugh et al., US 6,442,592 B1.

As to claims 1, 8 and 15, Moore teaches a method, a computer system, and a computer readable media of updating Web pages of an e-commerce storefront management user interface to enable efficient updating of the Web pages of the storefront, comprising (§ 43):

- a) Accessing a Web page out of a plurality of Web pages of an e-commerce Web site (§ 93);
- b) Submitting log in information to the Web site, wherein said log in information is for providing privileges sufficient to enable editing the Web site (§ 62, 94);
- c) Invoking a web page editor having a graphic user interface for editing the Web page (§ 43, 45, 93, 96 and Figs. 6-15);
- d) Selecting an item on the Web page to modify (§ 87-88 and Fig. 6);
- e) Editing the item on the Web page (Figs. 6-15);
- f) Submitting the edited item to the Web site (§ 96-97 and Figs. 15-16);
- g) Receiving an updated version of the Web page to view and verify the edited item (§ 93 and Fig. 16).

Moore does not specifically teach the log in information is submitted over an Intranet link, and said intranet link is separate from the internet. However, Alumbaugh teach login information is submitted over an Intranet link, and the intranet link is separate from the internet (column 3 lines 32-62 and Fig. 1; *the intranet link*

corresponds to communication between message center 102 and workstations 112 through LAN 114 within the Intranet 110, and the internet corresponds to 104 as shown in Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the log in information in Moore's teaching to be submitted through an Intranet link as taught by Alumbaugh for better preventing unauthorized access.

As to claims 2, 9 and 16, Moore teaches logging into the Web site with an authentication to obtain privileges for modifying Web pages of the Web site (§ 94).

As to claims 3, 10 and 17, Moore teaches receiving updated version of the Web page to view and verify the edit item as discussed above. Moore does not specifically teach logging out the Web site prior to receiving the updated version of the Web page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow Moore's teaching to include the feature of logging out the Web site prior to receiving the updated version of the Web page for reducing the conflict between the modification and updating of the web content.

As to claims 4, 11 and 18, Moore teaches the steps the management user interface is implemented with a web browser (§ 45).

As to claims 5, 12 and 19, Moore teaches viewing the updated version of the Web page using a web browser on a client machine to verify the appearance of the edited item, the appearance being the same as the appearance to a standard user accessing the updated version of the Web page (§ 93).

7. Claims 6, 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al., US 2001/0049672 A1 in view of Alumbaugh et al., US 6,442,592 B1, and in further view of Immerman et al., U. S. Patent 6,785,721 B1.

As to claims 6, 13 and 20, Moore modified by Alumbaugh teaches submitting log in information to Web page as discussed above. Moore does not specifically teach submitting a first log in information to obtain a first privilege level for editing the Web page and submitting a second log in information to obtain a second privilege level for editing the Web page, wherein the second privilege level is higher than the first privilege level for modifying a greater number of items of the Web page than the first privilege level. However, this matter is taught by Immerman as an access control list that specifies the level of access users and servers, and the administrator can specify an access level, access level privileges for each user name and server name (column 19 line 66 – column 20 line 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the teaching of Moore modified by Alumbaugh to include multiple privilege levels of access for securely controlling the content of the Web page.

8. Claims 7, 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al., US 2001/0049672 A1 in view Alumbaugh et al., US 6,442,592 B1, and in further view of Dabney, US 6,643,663 B1.

As to claims 7, 14 and 21, Moore modified by Alumbaugh does not specifically teach generating workflow notification to request an approval of the updated version of the Web page, wherein the updated version of the Web page is not provided until the

approval is obtained. However, this matter is taught by Dabney receiving the new edited content for approval and receiving a notification for the content being approved before dissemination (column 5 lines 31-43 and column 15 lines 26-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the teaching of Moore modified by Alumbaugh to include the feature of generating workflow notification to request an approval of the updated version of the Web page, wherein the updated version of the Web page is not provided until the approval is obtained as taught by Dabney for ensuring the quality of the edited content.

Inquire

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Cheung whose telephone number is (571)-272-6705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday from 10:00 AM to 7:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached on (571) 272-6712.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceedings is assigned are as follows:

- (571) 273-8300 (Official Communications; including After Final Communications labeled "BOX AF")
- (571) 273-6705 (Draft Communications)

/Mary Cheung/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3694
November 5, 2008